

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/678,379	10/06/2003	Donald R. VanDeripe		3529
75	90 08/09/2005	•	EXAM	INER
Donald R. VanDeripe			PATEL, MITAL B	
1534 Woodbury Drive St. Charles, MO 63304			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
•			3743	
		DATE MAILED: 08/09/2003	5	

DATE MAILED: 00/09/2009

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Typ
	Application No.	Applicant(s)
<b>A</b>	10/678,379	VANDERIPE, DONALD R.
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
	Mital B. Patel	3743
The MAILING DATE of this communic Period for Reply	cation appears on the cover sheet wi	ith the correspondence address
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOTHE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNION.  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication of the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30). If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum states a Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply within the set or extended perio	CATION. of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no-event, however, may a runication. ) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirt tutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MON will, by statute, cause the application to become AB	reply be timely filed  ty (30) days will be considered timely.  ITHS from the mailing date of this communication.  BANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
Status		
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed	d on <u>06 October 2003</u> .	
	b)⊠ This action is non-final.	
3) Since this application is in condition f	or allowance except for formal matt	ers, prosecution as to the ments is
closed in accordance with the practic	e under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D	). 11, 453 O.G. 213.
Disposition of Claims		
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1 and 2</u> is/are pending in the	e application.	
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/ar	e withdrawn from consideration.	
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.		•
6) Claim(s) 1 and 2 is/are rejected.		
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.		
8) Claim(s) are subject to restrict	lon and/or election requirement.	
Application Papers		
9) The specification is objected to by the		·
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are:		
Applicant may not request that any object	<del>-</del> · · ·	· ·
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including	-	
11)⊠ The oath or declaration is objected to	by the Examiner. Note the attached	d Office Action of form P10-152.
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim f a) All b) Some * c) None of:	or foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. §	119(a)-(d) or (f).
<u> </u>	documents have been received.	•
2. Certified copies of the priority of	•	pplication No
3. Copies of the certified copies of		•
application from the Internation	nal Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	·
		received.

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-326 (Rev. 1-04)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)

Attachment(s)

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.

6) Other: \_

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

## **DETAILED ACTION**

## Oath/Declaration

1. The oath or declaration is defective. A new oath or declaration in compliance with 37 CFR 1.67(a) identifying this application by application number and filing date is required. See MPEP §§ 602.01 and 602.02.

The oath or declaration is defective because: Non-initialed and/or non-dated alterations have been made to the oath or declaration. See 37 CFR 1.52(c).

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
  - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 3. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* v. *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:
  - Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
  - 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
  - 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
  - 4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Application/Control Number: 10/678,379

Art Unit: 3743

4. Claims 1-2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Garrett (US 6,001,332).

Page 3

- 5. As to claim 1, Garrett teaches a method of inhalation of specific gas mixtures in a human patient with exhaled gases being shunted into the ambient atmosphere to effect 50-90% or more washout of nitrogen gas from the body, body water, ischemic tissues, and mitochondria in order to allow the reuptake of oxygen into hypoxic mitochondria and restore oxidative metabolism to affected tissues following reversible vascular occlusions in a cerebrovascular accident (stroke), the administration of said gas mixture being from a suitable supply source and being implemented as quickly as possible following the vascular event, wherein the specific gas mixtures consist only as complimentary concentrations off 20-100% oxygen and 0-80% helium (See Col. 2, lines 1-7 and lines 55-67). Garrett teaches essentially all of the limitations except for wherein the implementation process continues for a minimum of 30 minutes up to 72 hours. However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention that implementation time would vary according to the individual (infant, child, adult) along with the severity of the vascular event and such a timed implementation would be obvious to the medical personnel administering the gas.
- 6. **As to claim 2**, Garrett teaches a method wherein the vascular event to be treated is myocardial infarction.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mital B. Patel whose telephone number is 571-272-4802. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday (11:00-7:30).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Henry Bennett can be reached on 571-272-4791. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Mital B. Patel Examiner Art Unit 3743